

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*SH*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/090,119 06/04/98 HALSTEAD

M 777.090US1

TM02/0522

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

FOURSON, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED:

05/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks*SH*

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/090,119	Applicant(s) HALSTEAD
Examiner Gary Fourson	Group Art Unit 2151



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gary Fourson (3) _____
(2) Barbara Level (4) _____

Date of Interview May 11, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 9 and 18

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In response to Applicant's inquiry to the status of dependent claims 9 and 18 regarding the non-final rejection (paper no. 4) mailed February 28, 2001, Examiner notified Barbara Level that dependent claims 9 and 18 were to have been included with the rejections under paragraph 2 (35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henckel (6,105,036)) and paragraph 5 (35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celi, Jr. et al. (6,157,933) in view of Jawarski (Java 1.1 Second Edition)), respectively. A corrected copy of the office action is being attached to this Interview Summary as well as faxed to Applicant for expedited attention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. **Claims 1-3, 8-11, 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henckel (6,105,036).**

With respect to claims 1, 8, 10, 15, and 19, reading a persistent representation [col 4 line 21, source file] of a complex data object [col. 4 line 21, multimedia objects] containing a sequence of executable instructions [col 4 lines 24-25, “ordered arrangement of program statements”] directly executable on a program interpreter [col 4 lines 33-36], and the program interpreter for executing/interpreting the instructions as a sequence/series of calls [col 4 lines 24-25, “ordered arrangement of program statements”] on a library of predefined functions [Henckel notes in col 4 lines 41-51 that VRML is one example of a language providing a collection of interpretable statements.] to directly construct [col 4 lines 58-67 states, “As discussed above, embodiments ... display objects in ...or multimedia representations.”] the multi-component data object from the representation.

As to claims 2, 3, 9, 11, and 16, Henckel teaches display or presentation of multimedia objects [col 4 lines 58-67].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 12-14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henckel (6,105,036).**

As to claims 12-14 and 21, the interpreter is a local stack-based virtual machine including a temporary storage array. Examiner takes "Official Notice" (see MPEP 2144.03) that the advantages of utilization of virtual machine operating systems on stack based processing hardware were well known at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the virtual machine in combination with the teachings of Henckel, because the accepted benefits of the stack based virtual machine would have been expected when utilized for its known intended purpose.

5. **Claims 1, 4-7, 15, 17-19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celi, Jr. et al. (US 6,157,933) in view of Jaworski (Java 1.1 Second Edition).**

With respect to claims 1, 4-7, 15, 17-19, and 20, reading a persistent representation [Java animation image applet stored on server], interpreting the instructions [As was known to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, Java applets are comprised of Java byte codes interpreted by a Java Virtual Machine included with many common HTML browsers], calling different ones of

Art Unit: 2151

predefined functions in accordance with the instructions to construct the data object directly from the representation [col 3 lines 1-13],

Jaworski provides example applets on pages 734-737. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the example applets of Jaworski with the embedded web page requesting/displaying of Celi, Jr. et al., because Celi, Jr. et al. recognized that applet content may be embedded. From the code example listings 40.1-40.4, Jaworski teaches wherein some functions return an explicit result [Listing 40.1, “public void paint” returns the result “Graphics g”], wherein some functions have arguments [Listing 40.1 calls functions “g.setFont,” “g.setColor,” “and “g.drawString,” which all use arguments.], a call to one of the functions includes a call to another function as an argument of the first function [”g.setFont utilizes the method “new Font” as an argument], a call to one of the functions includes obtaining a constant value as its argument [see “g.drawString”], and wherein some of the instructions are compressed identifiers for different ones of a predefined set of methods [Method resolution between similarly named functions in object oriented programming may be facilitated through argument matching.].

Pertinent Prior Art

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Dyer et al. (US 5,754,849) teaches self-describing objects for storage and transmission across system boundaries.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Gary Fourson** at telephone number **(703) 305-4392** or E-mail at the address **gary.fourson@uspto.gov**.

Art Unit: 2151

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax numbers for formal (703-308-9051), to be intended for entry into the application, or informal (703-305-9731) communications may be utilized for expedited transactions.

gsf

May 10, 2001



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100